



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/811,848

03/19/2001

Doron Elgressy

063170.6653(20000059)

1687

5073

7590

02/23/2006

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

2001 ROSS AVENUE

SUITE 600

DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/811,848

Applicant(s)

ELGRESSY ET AL.

Examiner

Courtney D. Fields

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 and 13-16 have been amended.
2. Claims 1-16 and 18-33 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 07 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Referring to the rejection of claim 1, the Applicant contends that the prior art (Touboul) does not teach, disclose, nor suggest denying one or more threads of an application access to a secured resource if the one or more threads has previously exhibited Internet behavior and has not met a specific condition for accessing the secured resource. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Touboul does teach each and every element of claim 1. Touboul discloses a network system and method for protecting a client during runtime from hostile downloadables (i.e. Java or Active X objects) comprising a server. The server is coupled a communication channel which allows the client to communicate over the Internet. (See Column 2, lines 53-67) When an application receives an Internet executable (i.e. Java or Active X object), it is stored within a temporary directory (i.e. data storage device) and only when the executable has been downloaded from the Internet, one of the threads (i.e. applet) downloads an Internet executable (i.e. Java or Active X object). (See Column 3, lines 31-54) Within the security system, the operating system probes recognizes applet instructions, therefore, a message is indicated to inform the event router. Upon receipt of a message, the event router forwards the message for notifying the user of the

Art Unit: 2137

request, to an event log and memory management system probe which records and monitors suspicious operations. Suspicious operations are denied if the runtime monitor detect violation of an applet using more than two megabytes of RAM or when the Java virtual machine attempt to run more than five applets concurrently. (See Column 4, lines 1-23, Column 31-62). When the thread (i.e. applet) attempts to access a secured resource (i.e. client's computer, network computer, etc.), the thread is denied access if the Internet behavior of the downloadable exhibits suspicious behavior and violates (i.e. does not meet) the security policy rules. The downloadable is terminated (denied access) (See Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-13)

5. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-33 are maintained in view of the reasons above and in view of the reasons below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 10-16, 18-20 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Touboul, U.S. Patent No. 6,167,520.

Referring to claims, 1,2,and 13-16, Touboul discloses a network system and method for protecting a client during runtime from hostile downloadables (i.e. Java or Active X applets) comprising a server. Touboul defines a downloadable as being a small executable which is downloaded from a source computer and run on a destination computer. The network system comprises a server coupled to the Internet or Intranet, which is coupled to an individual computer including a security system for protecting the client from hostile or suspicious downloadable activity. The server is coupled to a communication channel which allow the client to communicate over an Intranet or Internet. (See Column 2, lines 53-67) Within the security system, operating system probes recognizes applet instructions, therefore, a message is indicated to inform the event router. Upon receipt of a message, the event router forwards the message for notifying the user of the request, to an event log which records and monitors suspicious operations. Suspicious operations are denied if the runtime monitor detect violation of an applet using more than two megabytes of RAM or when the Java virtual machine attempt to run more than five applets concurrently. The application (downloadable) is sent to the client and the event is recorded in an event log. (See Column 5, lines 31-62). The applet will be terminated and the memory or processor time available to the applet will become limited and if the Internet behavior of the downloadable exhibits suspicious behavior and violates (do not meet) the security policy rules, the downloadable is terminated (denying access)(See Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-13).

Referring to claim 3, Touboul discloses an response engine that determines a security policy to dictate over the execution of downloadables if an applet violates the

security policy, the information is sent to a suspicious downloadables database in Column 4, lines 51-60)

Referring to claim 4, Touboul discloses the claimed limitation wherein the downloadables are harmless in Column 6, lines 15-33, 41-44.

Referring to claims 5 and 18-20, Touboul discloses the claimed limitation wherein the Internet behavior disables the network connection in Column 5, lines 53-55, 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-9.

Referring to claims 10-12 and 31-33, Touboul discloses the claimed limitation wherein access to a secure resource is denied in Column 5, lines 31-67, Column 6, lines 1-23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-9 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,167,520 in view of Ji et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,623,600.

Referring to claims 7 and 24-26, Touboul et al. teaches the invention as claimed. However, Touboul et al. does not explicitly disclose a communication protocol such as HTTP, FTP, SMTP, or the like. Referring to claims 6, 21-23, Ji et al. discloses the

claimed limitation wherein the Internet behavior is disabled by specific protocols such as FTP or SMTP. (See Column 8, lines 25-34)

Referring to claims 7, 24-26, Ji et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the specific protocols comprising FTP and SMTP can be used for detecting viruses in file transfers and messages being downloaded and sent into or out of a network. (See Abstract and Column 5, lines 28-38)

Referring to claims 8, 27-29, Ji et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the Internet behavior disables the transfer of executable objects in communication protocols. (See Column 7, lines 4-67, Column 8, lines 1-16)

Referring to claims 9 and 30, Ji et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the access to trusted sites via FTP is granted. (See Column 8, lines 43-65)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Touboul's system and method by combining Ji et al.'s virus detection of downloadables on FTP and SMTP servers. This modification would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prevent hostile applets from being downloaded and exposed upon the network to secure resources.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2137

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

COA

cdf

February 15, 2006

Matthew D. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137